



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/450,073	11/29/1999	Orest W. Blaschuk	100086.405C2	7100

500 7590 03/13/2003

SEED INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW GROUP PLLC  
701 FIFTH AVE  
SUITE 6300  
SEATTLE, WA 98104-7092

EXAMINER

GUPTA, ANISH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1654

DATE MAILED: 03/13/2003

15

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/450,073

Applicant(s)

BLASCHUK ET AL.

Examiner

Anish Gupta

Art Unit

1654

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 December 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 and 26-33 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 16-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 14.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### DETAILED ACTION

1. The Amendment filed 12-05-02 is acknowledged. Claims 2, 17 and 27 were amended. Claims 1-33 are pending in this application.

#### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

2. The rejection of claims 2-5, 7-15, 17-18, 20-25, 27-30, 32-33 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention is hereby withdrawn.

#### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 16-25 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention for the reasons set forth in the previous office action and the reasons set forth below.

Applicants argue that rejection does not provide any specific support that “one of the ordinary skill in the art, in view of the teachings in the present application, would be able to use cell adhesion modulating agents in treating cancer without undue experimentation.” Applicants request specific support for the basis of a non-enabling disclosure. Applicants argue that the specification

provides sufficient guidance to enabled the using of cell adhesion modulating agents in treating cancer. Applicants make reference to the general teachings in the specification that teach the inhibition of angiogenesis and the treatment of cancer. Applicants conclude by stating that an applicant is not required to specifically exemplify all requirements of the invention that are encompassed by the invention.

Applicant's arguments filed 12-05-02 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants have requested support that the instant application does not have an enabling disclosure. To begin, the treatment of cancer and angiogenesis has spotty at best. The art indicates that anti-angiogenic drugs, while effective in vitro and in mice, are not effective in humans. For example, Dermer states that “immunotherapy’s killing power of the transformation of 3T3 cells by a mutated protooncogene, simply does not have the same significance for cells in vivo.” (See page 320). Further, “[t]he facts indicate, however, that petri dish cancer is really poor representation of malignancy, with characteristics profoundly different from human disease.” (See page 320). Similar sentiments are echoed in a Science article by Trisha Gura. In this article, it has been indicated that the fundamental problem in cancer research is that model systems are not predictive of in-vivo activity (see page 1041). The article goes on to state xenograft models in mice “don’t behave like naturally occurring tumors in humans--they don’t spread to other tissues.” (See page 1041). Further, other systems such as clonogenic assays are not always helpful since they “can’t always predict how a tumor will respond to a drug in an animal” and “[s]ometimes they don’t work because the cells simply fail to divide n culture.” (See page 1042). In essence, the art indicates that “rodents are better predictors of human reaction to cardiovascular or anti-inflammatory agents than cancer or diseases of the central nervous system.” (See Time article by Frederic Golden on page

44). In the instant application, the specification does not provide for any examples, including either in-vitro or even mouse examples for the treatment of cancer. If one cannot readily predict the effects of a anti-angiogenic drug in vivo, even when in-vitro and mouse models are furnished, how can one reasonably predict the effects of the peptide in the instant application when no evidence has been furnished. Applicants state that they are not required to exemplify all embodiments of the invention. While this is generally true, it must not be forgotten lack of a working example, however, is a factor to be considered, especially in a case involving an unpredictable and undeveloped art. When a patent applicant chooses to forego exemplification and bases utility on broad terminology and general allegations, he runs the risk that unless one with ordinary skill in the art would accept the allegations as obviously valid and correct, the examiner may, properly, ask for evidence to substantiate them. *In re Novak*, 306 F.2d 924, 134 USPQ 335 (CCPA 1962) 4; *In re Fouché*, 439 F.2d 1237, 169 USPQ 429 (CCPA 1971). As stated in the previous office action, applicants specification is quite similar to disclosure of *Ex parte Sudilovsky*, where it was held that the disclosure was non-enabling since:

"[t]he strong feeling one gets from reading the entire specification is that either appellant did not have possession of the details of a single operative process or, if he did, he chose not to divulge them."

*Ex parte Sudilovsky*, 21 U.S.P.Q2d 1702 (BPAI 1991). Similarly, the disclosure of the instant application, with regard to the peptides and treatment of cancer, is confined to a broad allegations and suggestions without substantiating working examples.

Rejection is maintained.

4. The references of Dermer, Gura, and Golden have been provide to show the state of the art with respect to angiogenesis and cancer at the request of the Applicant.

5. Claims 1-15 and 26-33 are allowed.

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.


7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anish Gupta whose telephone number is (703) 308-4001. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brenda Brumback , can normally be reached on (703)306-3220. The fax phone number of this group is (703) 308-4242.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

Serial Number: 09/450,073  
Art Unit: 1653

Page 6

  
Anish Gupta

  
**BRENDA BRUMBACK**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**  
**TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600**